

JUL 18 2007

ATTORNEY DOCKET
076041.0155PATENT APPLICATION
10/658,793Proposed Claim Amendment

22. (Proposed Amendment) A portable, high-efficiency liquid oxygen (LOX) storage/delivery apparatus, comprising:

a portable LOX container;

a portable-unit LOX transfer connector connected to said portable container and capable of receiving and transferring LOX to said portable container;

an economizer valve for minimizing venting by balancing gaseous oxygen withdrawn from said portable LOX container via a first conduit and liquid oxygen withdrawal from said portable LOX container via a second conduit;

a conserving device; and

a portable-unit oxygen gas transfer connector for transferring oxygen gas to an oxygen gas delivery device for delivery;

~~said portable LOX container being configured to hold about one pound of LOX when fully charged with LOX; and~~

~~wherein said LOX storage/delivery apparatus can last approximately 10 hours at a typical patient use rate of about 2 liters per minute.~~

Interview Summary and Remarks

Attorney for Applicants, Eric Grabski, spoke with Examiner Kiandra Lewis by telephone today, July 18, 2007 regarding the allowability of pending independent Claim 22. In particular, Mr. Grabski and Examiner Lewis discussed the limitation "an economizer valve for minimizing venting by balancing gaseous and liquid oxygen withdrawal from said portable LOX container" in light of the cited reference *Nicastro* (GB 1185199). Examiner Lewis indicated that this limitation did not clearly indicate that gaseous oxygen is withdrawn from the portable LOX container. Mr. Grabski proposed amending the limitation to clarify that both gaseous oxygen and gaseous liquid are withdrawn from the portable LOX container. This proposed amendment is presented above.

In addition, Applicants propose removing the last two limitations, as shown above. The Examiner indicated in the Final Office Action that these limitations would be obvious based on the disclosure in the cited references and thus removing these limitations should not affect the allowability of Claim 22.